

REMARKS

Applicants will address each of the Examiner's objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Specification

In the Office Action, the Examiner objects to the abstract of the disclosure for the use of "legalese" language. Accordingly, Applicants have prepared a new Abstract of the Disclosure and are submitting it herein. No new matter has been added. It is respectfully submitted that this amendment overcomes the Examiner's objection, and it is requested that the objection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 12 and 27

The Examiner also rejects Claims 12 and 27 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Park (US 6,211,538) in view of Thompson et al. (US 6,245,393) and Postupack (US 4,138,284).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, Park is directed to a method for manufacturing an EL device. As the Examiner admits, Park does not disclose forming a light-emitting film on an electrode by an ink jet method or wherein the light-emitting film forming step, the conductive film forming step and the insulating film forming step are carried out while holding a substrate having the electrode in a manner that an angle subtended by a surface of the substrate and the direction of gravity is within a range of from 0 to 30°, as in independent Claims 12 and 27 of the present application.

The Examiner, however, contends that Thompson teaches an ink jet method, that Postupack

teaches “forming layers on a substrate are carried out while holding a substrate having the electrode in a manner that an angle subtended by a surface of the substrate and the direction of gravity is within a range of from 0 to 30°,” and that “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the ink jet method of Thompson and the film application of Postupack with the EL manufacturing method of Park.” Applicants respectfully disagree.

More specifically, Postupack appears to be directed to a coating of glass or plastic sheeting that is used for automobiles and windows in vehicles and buildings. See e.g. col. 1, lns. 37-46 in Postupack. Postupack does not disclose or suggest forming a light-emitting device, a method for forming a light-emitting device, or forming layers in a light-emitting device. Hence, Postupack is not relevant to the present invention or the field of this invention, and there would have been no motivation for one skilled in the art to combine Postupack with Park and Thompson to arrive at the claimed invention. Therefore, the combination of these references to arrive at the claimed method for producing a light-emitting device is improper.

Further, an advantage of the present invention is that “the whole processing is conducted in a state where the substrates are erected, making it possible to decrease the footprint of the production apparatus and to greatly increase the degree of freedom in the step of designing, such as laying out the clean room”. See e.g. page 6, lns. 18-23 of the specification for the present application. None of the cited references disclose or appreciate this resulting advantage, and hence, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to arrive at the claimed invention from the teachings in these references.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of references is improper, that the resulting rejection is improper, and that the cited references do not disclose or suggest the

claimed invention. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 13, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 24, 25, 28, 29, 31, 32, 35, 36, 39 and 40

The Examiner also rejects Claims 13, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 24, 25, 28, 29, 31, 32, 35, 36, 39 and 40 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Park in view of Postupack. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

More specifically, in this rejection, the Examiner admits that Park does not disclose that the light-emitting film forming step, the conductive film forming step and the insulating film forming step are carried out while holding a substrate having the electrode in a manner that an angle subtended by a surface of the substrate and the direction of gravity is within a range of from 0 to 30°, as in independent Claims 13, 14, 28 and 29 of the present application. As a result, the Examiner cites Postupack for the same reasons discussed above for independent Claims 12 and 27.

However, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that this combination of references to arrive at the claimed invention and rejections based thereon are also improper, and that the cited references do not disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 15, 18, 19, 22, 23, 26, 30, 33, 34, 37, 38, 39 and 41

The Examiner also rejects Claims 15, 18, 19, 22, 23, 26, 30, 33, 34, 37, 38, 39 and 41 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Park in view of Postupack and further in view of Arai (US 6,369,507). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above

for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion


It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee is due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 5, 2006


Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street
Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 000026568